



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,880	12/20/2001	Ta-Ko Chuang	B-4442 619416-6	4650

7590 04/01/2004  
Richard P. Berg, Esq.  
c/o LADAS & PARRY  
Suite 2100  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90036-5679

EXAMINER

AFTERGUT, JEFF H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1733

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. 10/028,880	Applicant(s) CHUANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Jeff H. Aftergut	Art Unit 1733	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED      FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 4-6.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Jeff H. Aftergut  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1733

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As previously presented in the FINAL rejection, it was well known that two different lasers which emitted different wavelengths of light would have been used to cut a glass substrate and a buffer layer disposed upon the glass substrate as suggested by Choo. Choo additionally provided the motivation to melt (grind) the edge of the glass to bevel the same via laser as the use of a laser would have eliminated static charge as opposed to the use of a mechanical cutting operation (which was known to act upon a protective circuit and a glass substrate in the admitted prior art). The reference the admitted prior art suggested that one skilled in the art would have incorporated both the protective circuit and the glass material at the edge. The admitted prior art suggested that the edge where both members were present was bevelled mechanically. To bevel the same with a laser to eliminate static charge build up would have been obvious in light of Choo. One viewing Choo as a whole would have readily appreciated that because two different materials were present at the edge two different lasers would have been necessary to melt the edge as such was employed in the melting/cutting of the assembly away from the edge. To bevel and/or smooth out the same disposed at the edge, one skilled in the art when viewing the teachings of Choo as a whole would have readily appreciated that two separate lasers would have been needed to machine the edge where the protective circuit was located, one for the protective circuit material and one for the glass material (as two would have been needed for machining wherein one cut the layers one would have understood the need for two for grinding and/or melting to smooth out the edge). While no reference anticipates the claimed invention, one viewing the prior art as a whole would have envisioned the use of two lasers to melt the edge of the laminate in order to smooth the same and the use of laser as opposed to mechanical machining would have been suggested as such eliminated static build up. .